

tion to two articles that appeared recently, suggesting areas where these cuts could be made.

[From the Moline Daily Dispatch,
 July 2, 1968]

THE UNTOUCHABLE: MILITARY SPENDING

Military expenditures are sacred cows. Too often, voting against them is commonly regarded as the equivalent of voting against national defense—and the flag.

It is virtually impossible for ordinary citizens—and many members of Congress—to make informed judgments as to just what military programs are and are not worth the money spent on them in terms of maintaining the nation's armed strength at a necessary level.

In this area of government, most people have to make a selection of the particular brand of experts on whose opinions they are going to rely. Congressional Quarterly has a deserved reputation for objectivity and accuracy in reporting on events and trends in the national capital, and when this service concludes, as it does in the article on this page today, that the military budget is dripping with "fat," it is (but probably won't be) cause for action by the expenditure-trimmers in Congress.

The need to sharply reduce the expenses of the federal government, as one phase of the effort to slow down inflation and to buttress the international standing of the dollar, is clear and present—and widely agreed to among the various wings of political opinion. The Johnson Administration has agreed to cut its budget by \$6 billion, in exchange for congressional approval of the income surtax.

On the basis of this Congressional Quarterly piece, and other sources of information, it appears that a great deal of the budget cut—if not all of it—could be made in military expenditures.

But neither the White House nor Congress is likely to so act. Any expenditure that has a "national defense" tag on it promises to be popularly acceptable; also at work in this sector is the influence of the "military-industrial complex," which, as Congressional Quarterly set forth in a previous article, often causes money to be spent on military projects of dubious value.

The economists are wielding their hatchets most openly on appropriations for urban rehabilitation, anti-poverty programs, education and other undertakings, directed at calming the crisis of the cities and the racial unrest. They say that while these programs may be desirable, the country can't afford them in a time of war and debilitation of the dollar. Their arguments sound plausible until one contemplates all that "fat" in the military budget.

A specific example of military projects of dubious value is that of the anti-ballistic missile system—a system of defense missiles designed to shoot down intercontinental missiles fired by an enemy.

The Senate recently, by a large margin, approved an initial outlays of money for a so-called "thin" ABM system (aimed at China). The cost estimate on this enterprise is \$5.5 billion. But that might be just a beginning. Backers of this plan want to go all the way with an ABM defense against Soviet missiles. That would cost at least \$40 billion—probably much, much more than that.

On the surface, it seems like a very good idea to protect the country against Soviet and Chinese missiles, hang the cost. The joker here is that, in the opinion of many persons highly qualified to have an opinion on the subject (including former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara) any anti-missile defense is essentially futile, for the reason that no conceivable defense system could be perfect and that enough enemy missiles could penetrate any system to virtually wipe out the country. One (ONE!) nuclear missile can destroy a city.

In an age of nuclear missiles, the best defense is an overwhelming offensive capability—the most effective deterrent to nuclear war is the "balance of terror."

If this is true, how necessary is an ABM program costing \$40 billion (and up and up)?

[From the Congressional Quarterly, June 28, 1968]

DEFENSE BUDGET CUTS OF \$10.8 BILLION SEEN
 FEASIBLE

Defense experts both in and outside the Government have told Congressional Quarterly that huge cuts can be made in the defense budget while retaining or even improving the current level of the nation's defense.

Highly placed sources in the Pentagon and industry told CQ that cuts totaling at least \$10.8 billion could be made in areas they classified as "fat." None of the cuts would affect U.S. combat capabilities, they said. Instead, only logistical elements they view as excessive and weapon systems they consider overlapping, unnecessary or of doubtful combat effectiveness would be cut back.

Although numerous officials in the Pentagon favor the massive cuts, the actual decisionmakers remain unconvinced. Defense Secretary Clark M. Clifford told a June 20 press conference that the Administration probably would impose defense spending cuts of \$2 to \$3 billion as part of the \$6 billion reduction ordered by Congress as the price of enactment of President Johnson's coveted tax increase. One Pentagon source who favors the higher cuts told CQ it was surprising that Clifford would accept any reductions at all, in view of "pressures from the military and defense industries to keep the budget intact."

In addition to the logistical support, the major areas cited by sources as "fat" include the new antiballistic missile system (ABM), "unnecessarily sophisticated" equipment in both Air Force and Navy aircraft, an expensive air defense system deployed against what sources see as "weak and outmoded" Soviet bomber forces, the Army's helicopter program and antisubmarine carrier task forces of high cost and, sources said, "dubious" combat effectiveness.

One Pentagon civilian said these areas tied down "fantastic amounts of manpower despite the generally low level of combat effectiveness they afford. Cutting them back in many cases actually would improve the nation's defense. Not only would additional manpower be freed for direct combat needs, but the mobility of U.S. forces would be enhanced by the lack of extraneous equipment and a sluggish logistical tail." By "de-escalating sophistication," he concluded, "we could escalate combat effectiveness."

In view of the Government's financial crisis, another official said, it would "border on the irresponsible if these programs are not cut back. These areas should be cut anyway, but in view of the nation's other pressing needs, the case is overwhelming."

Another Pentagon civilian said other funds might be saved by deferring desirable projects until later fiscal years. The source said there were "a lot of nice things the military would like to have and probably should have under normal circumstances. But with the dollar under attack, we can't just go on with business as usual. For the next year, at the very least, we've got to drive a Volkswagen instead of a Cadillac."

Sources emphasized that the cuts not only would mean dollar savings but also balance-of-payments gains. Cuts affecting overseas forces would be worth direct payments savings of almost \$1 billion. As the spending cuts cool the economy, they said, there would be further payments savings due to returns of capital which had flowed abroad to escape the U.S. inflation.

Clifford has not yet spelled out which areas will be cut to make up the planned reductions of \$2 to \$3 billion. Sources told CQ,

however, that the most likely action will be deferral of weapon systems rather than stripping programs they consider "fat." Some of the items Clifford reportedly is considering include the Navy's \$1.7 billion shipbuilding program, the Air Force's military space project, formation of a new 6th Army division, and new air defense missiles.

What follows is a compilation of major areas in which substantial cuts are thought feasible without reduction in the country's military strength; it is the result of detailed interviews in each area with numerous defense industry experts, civilian and military officials. The Administration's justification for funding each program also is presented.

Breakdown of proposed cuts

Following is a compilation of cuts that a consensus of CQ's sources feel could be made in the fiscal 1969 defense budget without diminishing U.S. combat capabilities (for details and Administration justifications, see text). Figures in parentheses are sub-totals.

Item:	Suggested cut
Antiballistic Missile System (ABM)	\$1.1 billion
Bomber Defense System (SAGE)	1 billion
Surface-to-Air Missiles	850 million
Manpower	(4.2 billion)
Army	2.2 billion
Navy	900 million
Air Force	675 million
Marine Corps	400 million
Tactical Aircraft Programs	(1.8 billion)
Army	510 million
Navy	635 million
Air Force	700 million
Antisubmarine Carrier Forces	400 million
Attack Carrier Forces	360 million
Amphibious Forces and Fast Deployment Logistic Ships (FDLS)	500 million
Manned Orbiting Laboratory	600 million
Total	10.8 billion

SOVIET INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA CONDEMNED

Czech
HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1968

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on August 24, the Minnesota Republican State Central Committee passed a resolution condemning the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia. The resolution urges the U.S. Government to do its utmost to cope with this new Soviet aggression, and to continue to recognize the Dubcek regime as he legitimate government.

I wish to commend our Minnesota nationalities chairman, Alexander Melnychenko, Jr., and his vice chairman, Erik Dundurs, for their sound initiative in bringing this resolution before the State committee. I request that the resolution be drawn to public attention through publication in the Record at this point in my remarks:

The Republican Party of Minnesota, being deeply shocked by the military invasion of Czechoslovakia, masterminded and executed by the Soviet Union and its cohorts, expresses its most sincere sympathies to the Czechoslovak people in their hour of sorrow and suffering.

It condemns the U.S.S.R. for the blatant violation of basic human rights of the citizens of Czechoslovakia in a malicious disregard of the United Nations charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Firmly believing in the implementation of Human Rights on a global basis, the Republican Party of Minnesota strongly urges the United States government to do its utmost, so as to properly and honorably cope with this renewed manifestation of Soviet aggression.

It further urges the continued recognition of the Dubcek regime by the United States as constituting the legitimate government of Czechoslovakia.

TROUBLE IN THE AIR

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of August 14, 1968, carried an editorial stating that "the overcrowding of the Nation's airways has reached alarming proportions." The editorial makes the further point that overcrowding of our airways is only one aspect of the transportation crisis which faces the Nation and it calls for concerted action by the Federal Government and private enterprise to develop not only emergency measures to meet the airways problem but also to construct a truly coordinated transportation system.

I strongly concur in the points made by the Wall Street Journal and so that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read the August 14 editorial, I include it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TROUBLE IN THE AIR

In recent weeks the overcrowding of the nation's airways has reached alarming proportions, particularly over large cities such as New York, Chicago, Washington and Los Angeles. The trouble in the air is in a sense only part of the problem of U.S. transportation generally.

Like other forms of transportation, the airways are operated by private enterprise and private firms must bear a share of the blame for the present difficulties. But a large part of the fault rests with the Government, which is deeply involved in every facet of travel.

The involvement, unfortunately, has developed piecemeal, with a minimum of planning and no central coordination. The upshot is something that hardly deserves to be dignified as a transportation "system."

Before the turn of the century the Government stepped in to regulate the railroads, fearing—with some reason—that they were abusing their near-monopoly position. The regulatory grip has loosened little in the ensuing three-quarters of a century, although the monopoly has been drastically undercut by the highways and airways.

As a result the railroads, not always too sprightly anyway, have lacked flexibility to adjust to meet new conditions. One effect has been the continuing disappearance of rail passenger service, which is still the most efficient means of getting people from one place to another.

Even without this development, highway and air travel would of course have grown; the growth has merely been speeded. Yet the Government has mainly floundered around while matters went from bad to worse.

On its face the Transportation Department, set up last year, was supposed to be an effort to pull the Government together. So far, however, the new department has not been given the power to accomplish much. Private lobbies still push their friends in

Congress for more Federal funds for roads, airports or whatever.

The present airways mess obviously calls for emergency measures. Perhaps the suggestion of higher fares in peak travel hours (provided they're accompanied by lower fares in off-hours) would help lessen the traffic jams that have developed over major airports in the past few weeks. The schedule changes discussed at yesterday's airline meeting also may be of help.

On a longer-range basis, much more obviously must be done. With larger and larger airplanes, and more and more passengers, a certainty, the air travel situation otherwise will get completely unmanageable.

One obvious step is a true coordination of Federal transportation efforts. Since the Government seems sure to be involved in transit into the indefinite future, it is high time that it start looking at the entire situation, not separately at its various facets.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has already begun examining the need for rail passenger service; actually the question is not whether the need exists but how great the need is. Perhaps the service has so far degenerated that it can be revived only with substantial subsidy; if so, so be it.

With a broad view of transportation, perhaps the Government could more accurately gauge transit trends; the Federal Aviation Administration has admitted a vast underestimation of air travel gains, which has contributed to the shortage of traffic control personnel. Perhaps, too, it will then be possible to control the planless proliferation of superhighways across the land. The Government cannot deliver a reliable transportation system on its own, but it certainly should stop working at cross purposes to prevent its realization.

That is, or at least ought to be, something for Federal officials to think about as they are stacked up over Washington's National Airport trying to get to work.

ADVICE NEEDED ON HOW TO RETURN MONEY TO UNCLE SAM

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1968

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of the House to a school district in my area which, for more than a year, has been trying without success to return money to the Federal Government.

This is what has happened:

On September 20, 1966, Regional School District No. 10, comprising the towns of Harwinton and Burlington in my district, received \$3,744 in Federal aid for educationally deprived children under Public Law 89-10.

During the period between September 20, 1966, and August 31, 1967, the district disbursed \$2,113.50 under this program to provide extra help for children requiring extra help. The program was discontinued by local officials who felt that it was not fulfilling its purposes.

This left a balance of \$1,630.50 which has been carried on the credit side of the school budget since August 31, 1967. It is deposited in a special account. School officials tell me that efforts by them and by the State department of education to return the money to the Federal Government have been unavailing.

I am sending a copy of this statement

to the Comptroller General of the United States. Surely, he will be able to advise me and the officials on how to turn back money to Uncle Sam.

Of course, this is but a microscopic drop of money in the sea of spending in Federal aid for education but one wonders if there are other similar situations across the land and how much of our tax money may be sitting in special accounts.

I praise the school district for refusing to continue an unproductive program. This is a splendid example for other communities and for the Federal Government itself. It seems absurd and regrettable, however, that this free-spending administration does not seem to understand what has happened and cannot handle the situation where someone actually wants to return unneeded funds to the Treasury.

A PLANK FOR ALL PARTIES: PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit for inclusion in the Record the text of my statement before the Democratic Party platform committee on August 19, 1968, urging approval of a firm plank pledging the Democratic Party to a program of aid to Israel to include the sale of Phantom supersonic jets as a means for preserving peace in the Middle East; as the prevention of further war between Israel and her Arab neighbors is of great importance to all American political parties and to all Americans.

The text of my statement is respectfully submitted as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE PANEL NO. 2—PLATFORM COMMITTEE, NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION—AUGUST 19, 1968, IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman: Our party platform must reflect our determination to achieve peace in the Middle East.

In the past we have affirmed and reaffirmed America's friendship for both Israel and her Arab neighbors. We want them to live together in peace.

The Six Day War made some things very clear. We cannot remain aloof and indifferent and rely on ineffective international agencies or instruments, on flimsy cease-fire arrangements and fragile armistices imposed on the parties.

We cannot ourselves withdraw and disavow our responsibility. We must take positive measures to curb the belligerent and encourage those who are desirous of peace. I am not a pessimist about peace. I believe that there are Arabs who would be willing to accept the reality of Israel. But they must be encouraged by the international community to come forward and make their views known.

We must commend the Johnson Administration for the strong stand it took by steadfastly refusing to yield to Soviet-Arab pressures to force Israel to withdraw without agreement after the June war. In light of the disastrous blunder that was made in 1957, Israel surely cannot be expected to withdraw from occupied territories except in the context of a general settlement which fixes